

### REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are rejected.

Claims 1-18 are pending

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 10-15, and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0159608 to *Heidari* (hereafter "*Heidari*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,804,017 to *Hector* (hereafter "*Hector*"). Applicant traverses.

Claim 1 is directed to a device for holding a nanolithography template used for imprinting a nanolithography pattern on a substrate. Claim 1 recites several elements in a cooperative relationship, i.e., a body having an opening to receive the nanolithography template, wherein the body is for positioning the template relative to the substrate for imprinting the nanolithography pattern on the substrate, and a supporting plate coupled to the body and positioned relative to the nanolithography template to support a force of the imprinting on the nanolithography template with the supporting plate being substantially transparent to a curing agent. The Office Action asserts that the vacuum supporting plate 14 in *Heidari* is equivalent to the supporting plate recited in Claim 1, but admits that *Heidari* fails to teach that it is transparent. The Office Action attempts to rectify this deficiency by asserting that "[I]t would have been obvious...to modify *Heidari* with [the] transparent support plate taught by *Hector* thereby allowing for the material worked upon to be cured by the UV source during imprinting operation." Applicant traverses this assertion. At the time of the invention, one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to combine the transparent plate in *Hector* with the body in *Heidari*. There is no need or requirement for supporting plate 14 in *Heidari* to be transparent. The polymer to be imprinted is not an ink-like liquid that needs to be solidified with UV curing. See paragraph [0006]. In direct contrast, *Heidari* teaches that supporting plate 14 is made of an opaque material. See paragraph [0046]. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion within *Heidari* that the polymer "worked upon is cured by an UV source during the imprinting

operation. Furthermore, the transparent plate 18 is not utilized in any way to support a force of the stamping process discussed in *Hector*. The plate 18 has the primary function of creating a cavity 32 so that a pressure differential can be produced in order to bulge out the stamper. See col. 3, lines 4-10 and col. 4, lines 18-25 and 43-47. As a result, there is no support for the motivation to combine the references as outlined in the Office Action. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Heidari* in view of *Hector* is traversed by the above arguments.

Claim 2 is dependent from Claim 1 and contains all the limitations of Claim 1. Claim 2 adds the limitation that the curing agent for Claim 1 comprises ultraviolet radiation. The Office Action does not specifically address Claim 2 relative to the combined teachings of *Heidari* and *Hector*. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the Office Action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness for Claim 2 for failing to specifically address the limitations of Claim 2. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the rejection for Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Heidari* in view of *Hector* is traversed by the above arguments and for the same reasons as Claim 1.

Claims 5-7 are dependent from Claim 1 and contain all the limitations of Claim 1. The Office Action does not specifically address all of the limitations recited in Claims 5-7 relative to the combined teachings of *Heidari* and *Hector*. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the Office Action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness for Claims 5-7 for failing to specifically address the limitations of these claims. The Office Action makes a brief mention that *Heidari* teaches vacuum connections 20 to hold firm the template 10 to the plate 14. This is not the same as a vacuum to hold the supporting plate 14 to the body 3, as recited in Claim 5. In fact, the supporting plate 14 is permitted to move freely in a space created by the parts 11a, 11b, and 11c. Therefore, this teaches away from Claim 5. *Hector* does not teach a vacuum, and in fact teaches the opposite by creating a positive pressure in cavity 32. Claims 11 and 14 are patentable for similar reasons.

Claim 8 is an independent claim. The Applicant asserts that the Office Action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness for Claim 8 for failing to specifically address the

limitations of these claims. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the rejection for Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Heidari* in view of *Hector* is traversed by the above arguments pertaining to Claim 1.

Claims 10-13 are dependent from Claim 8 and contain all the limitations of Claim 8. The Office Action does not specifically address Claims 10-13 relative to the combined teachings of *Heidari* and *Hector*. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the Office Action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness for Claims 10-13 for failing to specifically address the limitations of these claims. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the rejection for Claim 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Heidari* in view of *Hector* are traversed by the above arguments and for the same reasons as Claim 8.

Claim 14 is an independent claim. The Applicant asserts that the rejection for Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Heidari* in view of *Hector* is traversed by the above arguments relative to Claim 1.

Claims 15 and 17-18 are dependent from Claim 14 and contain all the limitations of Claim 14. The Office Action does not specifically address Claims 15 and 17-18 relative to the combined teachings of *Heidari* and *Hector*. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the Office Action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness for Claims 15 and 17-18 for failing to specifically address the limitations of these claims. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the rejection for Claim 15 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Heidari* in view of *Hector* are traversed by the above arguments and for the same reasons as Claim 14.

Claims 3-4, 9, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Heidari* in view of *Hector* and further in view of *Semiconductor Memories*.

Claims 3-4 are dependent from Claim 1 and contain all the limitations of Claim 1. Claims 3-4 add limitations to Claim 1 that are not specifically addressed by the Office Action. The Office Action only states that *Semiconductor Memories* teaches silicon dioxide as a backing support. The Applicant has shown that neither *Heidari* nor *Hector*, singly or in combination, teach or suggest the invention for Claim 1. The Office Action is silent regarding any teachings

of *Semiconductor Memories* relative to Claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the rejections for Claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Heidari* in view of *Hector* and further in view of *Semiconductor Memories* are traversed by the above arguments and for the same reasons as Claim 1. Claim 9 is dependent from Claim 8 and contain all the limitations of Claim 8. Claim 9 adds limitations to Claim 8 that are not specifically addressed by the Office Action. The Office Action only states that *Semiconductor Memories* teaches silicon dioxide as a backing support. The Applicant has shown that neither *Heidari* nor *Hector*, singly or in combination, teach or suggest the invention for Claim 8. The Office Action is silent regarding any teachings of *Semiconductor Memories* relative to Claim 8. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the rejection for Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Heidari* in view of *Hector* and further in view of *Semiconductor Memories* are traversed by the above arguments and for the same reasons as Claim 8.

Claim 16 is dependent from Claim 14 and contain all the limitations of Claim 14. Claim 16 adds limitations to Claim 14 that are not specifically addressed by the Office Action. The Office Action only states that *Semiconductor Memories* teaches silicon dioxide as a backing support. The Applicant has shown that neither *Heidari* nor *Hector*, singly or in combination, teach or suggest the invention for Claim 14. The Office Action is silent regarding any teachings of *Semiconductor Memories* relative to Claim 14. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the rejection for Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Heidari* in view of *Hector* and further in view of *Semiconductor Memories* is traversed by the above arguments and for the same reasons as Claim 14.

Applicant : Todd Bailey  
Serial No. : 10/747,737  
Filed : December 29, 2003  
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 21554-042002 / PA97

CONCLUSION


The rejections for Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are traversed.

The Applicant asserts that Claims 1-18 are now in condition for allowance and request an early allowance of these claims.

The fees are being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply all charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 21554-042002.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 3, 2008



Kelly K. Kordzik  
Reg. No. 36,571

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
One Congress Plaza  
Suite 810  
111 Congress Avenue  
Austin, TX 78701  
Telephone: (512) 472-5070  
Facsimile: (512) 320-8935